APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,655	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-005100US	4960

51206   7590   12/13/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
BELL, CORY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10/3/2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-26 have been examined.

Specification

2.   The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the

presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any

errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18-20, 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Implementing Oracle Workflow, Published in 1999, Known hereafter as

Mathieson in view of US 2004/0187127 (Gondi).

5.   **Claim 1** is rejected for the following reasons:

Mathieson Teaches:

1. A method of committing a transaction to a database, the method comprising: creating an electronic record that includes transaction data from the database transaction; {Figure 1 Shows that the record contains transaction data using the broadest reasonable interpretation } executing a rule associated with the record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review and/or approval of the electronic record, {Figures 3 and 5} requesting the electronic signature based on a determination that an electronic signature is required{ Figure 3 } However, Mathieson fails to expressly disclose: the transaction being an atomic action that initiates the transaction and checks that all requirements are fulfilled before committing the transaction. Yet, this feature would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as it is taught by Gondi figure 1 to provide the advantage of making all or none of the transaction committed.

6.   **Claim 2** is rejected for the following reasons:

2. The method of claim 1 wherein the electronic record comprises data generated from multiple tables of the database. { Matieson comprises multiple tables, and by incorporating the data from these tables would result in Maintaining a complete record. }

7.   **Claim 3** is rejected for the following reasons:

3. The method of claim 1 wherein the electronic record is stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the

database. {Mathieson Figures 11 and 12, l teach a secure audit trail for the database objects,

which inherently cannot be altered or disabled as it is used for proof of users signatures}

8.   **Claim 7** is rejected for the following reasons:

7. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of displaying at least some of the

transaction data in the electronic record on a computer display and requesting the electronic

signature based on the determination that an electronic signature is required {Mathieson Page 2

signature is applied to a field in the document}

9.   **Claim 9** is rejected for the following reasons:

9. The method of claim 1 further comprising obtaining and verifying the electronic

signature {Mathieson Inherently must check to see if the password is correct see page 2}

10.   **Claim 10** is rejected for the following reasons:

10. The method of claim 1 wherein the rule requires a plurality of different electronic signatures

and wherein, if execution of the rule results in a determination that a plurality of electronic

signatures are required, requesting the plurality of electronic signatures prior to committing the

data to the database. {Mathieson Figure 3}

11.   **Claim 11** is rejected for the following reasons:

11. The method of claim 9 wherein, if the electronic signature is rejected or otherwise cannot be

obtained, the transaction is rolled-back and not committed to the database.   {it is inherent that

the database manager would not allow a transaction to be committed wherein an electronic

signature was rejected, which would result in a roll- back, Gondi figure 1}

12.   **Claim 12** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 1 rejection.

13.   **Claim 13** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 2 rejection.

14.   **Claim 14** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 3 rejection.

15.   **Claim 18** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 9 rejection.

16.   **Claim 19** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 1 rejection.

17.   **Claim 20** is rejected for the following reasons:

20. The computer program of claim 19 wherein the code for creating an electronic record creates

electronic records in response to the occurrence of a predefined event. {Mathieson figures 2 and

3}

18.   **Claim 21** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 3 rejection.

19.   **Claim 25** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 9 rejection.

20.   Claims 4- 6, 15-17, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mathieson in view of Gondi in further view of 2001/0002485 known hereafter as Bisbee

and "Integrating XML and Databases" known hereafter as Bertino.

21.   **Claims 4 and 5** are rejected for the following reasons:

Mathison and Gondi fail to expressly disclose the use of XML Documents. Bisbee also teaches

the objects being XML documents, para 71. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to use XML as a well-known standard which provides the advantage of being

easily supported.   However, it is not expressly stated in the above mentioned references how the

data is stored within the database. Bertino teaches the storage of an unstructured XML document

as a column of a table as a CLOB datatype, page 86 col 1. Thus, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features as it provides

an organized method for storing the objects.

Also note, "Oracle Workflow Release 2.6.2 Business Event System and PL/SQL Development

Guidelines" teaches that Oracle Workflow typically uses XML Documents on page 15.

22.   **Claim 6** is rejected for the following reasons:

6. The method of claim 5 wherein XML fields of the data are filled with the transaction data

based on a predefined mapping of a data type definition to multiple data sources. {See Bertino,

The formatting of data into an XML file is inherently done using the mapping of a DTD to

multiple data sources, as the DTD defines how data is mapped and related in the XML file}

23.   **Claim 15** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 4 rejection.

24.   **Claim 16** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 5 rejection.

25.   **Claim 17** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 6 rejection.

26.   **Claim 22** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 4 rejection.

27.   **Claim 23** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 5 rejection.

28.   **Claim 24** is rejected for the following reasons:

29.   See claim 6 rejection.

Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in view of Gondi

in further view of Bisbee in view of Official Notice.

30.   **Claim 8** , as best understood, is rejected for the following reasons:

8. The method of claim 7 wherein the transaction data in the electronic record is displayed

according to a predefined layout set forth in an XSL style sheet and wherein the data further

comprises a copy of the electronic record as displayed in a second column of the database table.

Bisbee teaches XML for formatting the data and having data that contains copies{Para 100}, but

fails to expressly disclose how the data is presented to the user, and the data being stored in

tables. The examiner takes official notice that the use of XSL to provide a layout for displaying

XML documents was well known at the time of the invention, as was the ability to store data in

tables. Thus it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so a XSL is the

language for determining XML document presentation and store data in tables.

31.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in

view of Gondi in further view of Bisbee and Bertino and Official Notice.

32.   **Claim 26** is rejected for the following reasons:

26. A method of committing a transaction to a database, the method comprising: *creating an*

electronic record including transaction data associated with the transaction prior to committing

the associated database transaction to the database in response to the occurrence of a

predetermined event{See Claims 1 and 20 rejections}, *wherein the electronic record comprises*

the transaction data stored as a well-formed XML document {See claims 4 and 5 rejection} in a

character large-object (CLOB) format of a column of a database table; *storing the electronic*

record in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be

altered or deleted by users of the system; {see claim 3 rejection} *executing a rule associated with*

the electronic record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review

and/or approval of the electronic record; {see claim 1 rejection} and if execution of the rule

results in a determination that an electronic signature is required, (i) displaying the transaction

data in the electronic record according to a predefined layout set forth in an XSL style sheet

associated with the electronic record and storing a copy of the transaction data as displayed in a

character large-object (CLOB) format of a second column of the database table and (ii)

requesting, *obtaining and verifying the electronic signature prior to committing the transaction*

into a database. {See claim 9 rejection} and committing the transaction in response to verifying

the electronic signature {See claim 1 rejection}

Bisbee teaches the objects being XML documents, Para 71, however it is not expressly stated

how the data is stored within the database. Cheng teaches the storage of an XML document as a

column of a table as a CLOB data type. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in the invention of Bisbee as it provides a organized method for storing the objects.

Bisbee also fails to teach the use of XSL for displaying XML documents. The examiner takes official notice that the use of XSL to provide a layout for displaying XML documents was well known at the time of the invention. Thus it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so a XSL is the language for determining XML document presentation.

Bisbee para 33 teaches copies of the object being signed and stored and 106 teaches using versioning, however it fails to mention these documents being stored in a second column of a database table as a clob. The act of using a clob is discussed above, and the examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art to store updated versions of a document in a table with a column for each version. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature, as it would provide organized structure to the objects.

Conclusion

33.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 7039805 teaches a system for digitally signing documents. Oracle "Questions & answer document for Oracle Appsword" teaches Oracle e-business 11i.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER